



KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.  
200 PACIFIC BUILDING  
520 SW YAMHILL STREET  
PORTLAND OR 97204

**COPY MAILED**

**MAY 25 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
E. Mark Evers et al.  
Application No. 09/939,443  
Filed: August 24, 2001  
Attorney Docket No: JUBB301

**ON PETITION**

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)<sup>1</sup>, filed November 16, 2005, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A Final Office Action was mailed August 16, 2004 setting a three month shortened statutory period for reply. No response or request for an extension of time having been filed in this application prior to the expiration of the time set for reply, this application became abandoned November 17, 2004. Accordingly, a Notice of Abandonment was mailed March 7, 2005.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a continuation application under 37 CFR 1.53(b); (2) the petition fee of \$750; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay.

Since this application is being revived for purposes of continuity only and since continuity has been established by this decision reviving the application, the application is again abandoned in favor of continuation application no. 11/281,944 filed November 16, 2005, pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.53(b).

---

<sup>1</sup>Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

This matter is being referred to Technology Center 3621 for processing of the continuation application filed November 16, 2005.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patricia Faison-Ball". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Patricia Faison-Ball  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions